



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,403	12/28/2001	Nikolaus Schaller	1454.1204	8708

21171 7590 02/25/2004
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/019,403

Applicant(s)

SCHALLER, NIKOLAUS

Examiner

Quynh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10, 14, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,821,936) in view of Patent Abstract of Japan (Inventor: Sawada Toru; Application #: 09297214).

Regarding claim 10, Shaffer et al. teach the steps of: detecting each activation of a selection function (col. 3, lines 42-55); evaluating a result of said detecting using a predetermined evaluation for determining at least one of infrequently used supplementary and selection functions (col. 4, lines 15-21 and lines 37-39); resequencing the order of menu items to place most frequently used options at the top and the infrequently used options at the end of the display presentation (col. 4, lines 40-50). However, Shaffer et al. do not suggest outputting reference text corresponding to the at least one of infrequently used selection functions based on said evaluating.

Toru teaches outputting reference text ("displays to the user a message") indicating that total value of use-frequencies exceeds a threshold (see Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shaffer's system to outputting reference text on the display representation along with resequencing the order of menu items in order to introduce and explain to user of infrequently used functions or used-frequencies exceeds a threshold.

Regarding claims 14 and 18, Shaffer et al. teach comparing a predetermined reference value (Fig. 3, column 44 - "the original, or default, index") with the frequency of activation (col. 4, lines 15-21).

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 10 and 11. Furthermore, Shaffer et al. teach an input unit to activate at least one supplementary or selection function (col. 3, lines 42-55); and output unit (Fig. 1, 14).

3. Claims 11-13, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,821,936) in view of Patent Abstract of Japan (Inventor: Sawada Toru; Application #: 09297214) and further in view of Coulombe et al. (U.S. Patent 5,561,753).

Regarding claims 11 and 16, Shaffer et al. teach the electronic device is a telephone terminal with a display (telephone 10); a counter to detect the number of activations of the particular selection function (col. 4, lines 15-18). Shaffer et al. do not teach the evaluating includes determining a frequency of activation of the at least one of infrequently used functions in a predetermined period.

Coulombe et al. teach determining infrequently used functions in a predetermined period (col. 5, lines 10-13 - "a file has not been accessed within a selected period of time...should be relocated").

Art Unit: 2642

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shaffer's system to determine infrequently used functions in a predetermined period in order to improve the monitoring process.

Regarding claim 12, Coulombe et al. teach determining a trend of the frequency of activation in the predetermined period (col. 5, lines 14-21).

Regarding claims 13 and 17, Coulombe et al. teach determining a period that has elapsed since a most recent activation of the infrequently used functions (col. 5, lines 9-14).


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen
February 23, 2004


AHMAD F. MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700